

# CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

VOL. 2.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JESUS CHRIST.

NO. 11.

| \$1 50 in advance. |

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1825.

| \$2 at the end of the year. |

## CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

By BARZILLAI CRANSTON,

At No. 8, North Main-Street (3d story) near the Market-House.

Rev. DAVID PICKERING, Editor.

### REVIEW OF MR. FISK'S EXAMINATION.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39.)

The examination of Mr. Fisk, contained in the *Herald*, of Sept. 14th, embraces little more than a mere acknowledgment of the reviewer's arguments, without any attempt at refutation: For we should sincerely pity the weakness of any man, who was so short-sighted as to suppose that Mr. F. intended the remarks there inserted, as a refutation of Mr. P's arguments. Nothing more could have been intended than merely to give them a *go-by*.

We need not repeat, what we have before shown, namely, that Mr. F's language, in the sermon, so far as the terms were supposed to possess any proper meaning, were directed to support the *infinite magnitude* of sin: and we may quote, to strengthen the proof of this fact, one other expression:—"To violate these obligations, (*our obligations to obey God*), is a sin infinitely aggravated." Now, if a sin, that is, *any sin* of disobedience, be an offence infinitely aggravated, no offence can possibly exceed it in magnitude! For Mr. F. will not contend that *magnitude* means *duration*. Therefore, when he looks over his frequent charges of *misrepresentation* in this particular, he will, if he be an honest polemic, acknowledge the injustice of such charges, as well as abandon the indefensible position of *infinite sin*.

Our examiner seems to lament in deep and doleful strains, what he ventures to call the *blasphemy* of the reviewer; and in the immediate connexion of his lamentation, acknowledges and advocates this same *blasphemy*! The position which he calls *blasphemy*, is, that the *knowledge or capacity* of the transgressor must determine the *extent* of his criminality, and not the *dignity* of the character of the Law-giver.

As Mr. F. is a *trinitarian*, we will furnish a problem for his solution which will enable him to determine as to the accuracy of his charge of *blasphemy*. Suppose some inattentive observer had met the *child Jesus* when at the age of two years, and received a command from him to perform some act perfectly easy to be accomplished, and *refused* to do it; nay more—even *rebuked* him with a want of proper decorum, and a suitable respect to age;—Suppose, at the same time, that another is required to perform the same act by an immediate revelation from heaven, and is assured that a God of infinite wisdom, power and goodness has commanded this service, and this man treats the latter character with the same indignity as the other had done the former;—

would these two persons be criminal to the *same extent*? Or will Mr. F. find an apology for the former, by supposing him ignorant of the fact that this child was *really God*, veiled in an *infant form*? But this will only destroy his argument; for according to his doctrine, it is not the *knowledge* or capacity of the transgressor, but the *dignity* of God's character, which marks the *extent* of criminality; and the character, being the same in both cases, would render the criminality of the former, equally extensive with that of the latter! As ridiculously absurd as this doctrine is, it is nevertheless the doctrine which Mr. F. has laboured to maintain: and that without regard to the imperishable truth, that "where there is no knowledge there is no law, and where there is no law there is no transgression." Numerous arguments and evidences might be offered to expose the weakness of this main branch of Mr. F's doctrine, but what has already been presented, we think is sufficient to strip it of its covering; and it needs only to be seen, to be rejected. We must not dismiss this subject, however, without doing our examiner the justice of acknowledging that he has *denied* and *abandoned* this sentiment, and left it to seek a shelter where it may chance to find more *faithful friends*.—For he has stated, when speaking of the *nature of accountability*, (and a man can be *criminal* no farther than he is *accountable*), "that it is according to the light and means possessed." Hence it follows from his own concession, that unless the *light and means* of all men are the same, in extent, there must be a corresponding difference in the extent of their criminality.

We are not disposed to cast any severe censures upon Mr. F. for the glaring perversion of our sentiments, contained in the declaration, that universalism teaches us that "God's dignity is nothing to be regarded or feared!" For we must not expect any thing better from a man, who, at one moment affirms, and at the next, denies the sentiments of his own sermon. And we think it an idle waste of time to bestow any labour to refute such childish and groundless assertions.

We stated, as an unanswerable objection to Mr. F's theory of infinite sin, (vol. I, pages 150, 153,) that it utterly excluded the possibility of a just recompense of reward ever being received by any of the human family. This fact, Mr. F. acknowledges, without attempting to remove the objection. This is therefore left for his further reflection. At the same time, we request our readers to consult our arguments referred to, in vol. I, and then to judge for themselves, whether these arguments are, or are not unanswerable.

Mr. F. has again obtruded his third position upon the notice of his readers, notwithstanding it has been several times refuted: and it may with propriety be asked, why we bestow any farther notice upon it? We answer; because, what we have witnessed of

his studied evasion, and the readiness of some of his readers to receive whatever he advances, as new argument, notwithstanding it has been oft repeated, convinces us that it is necessary to refute his principal hypothesis by as many different arguments as there are forms in which it can be presented to the mind. His proposition is, that sin is an *infinite violation of our obligation*, without any reference to the knowledge of the subject. The only refutation which this statement requires, is found in James iv. 17—"To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Here the reader will see, that the knowledge of the subject is the proper basis of criminality, Mr. F's declaration to the contrary notwithstanding. Nor is it possible to conceive of *infinite obligations*, unless we apply the word to duration, (which, to say the least, is a barbarous use of the term,) in which case it would be necessary to prove that the continuance of such transgression will run parallel with the existence of Jehovah, which Mr. F. will never attempt, unless he wishes to burlesque every effort at theological argument.

Lastly; Mr. F. attempts to fault the reviewer for saying that "obligation arises in consideration of benefit received." He, however, acknowledges the correctness of the statement; but thinks we ought to have went further, and included *blessings offered* &c. He then mentions, what he calls *offered blessings*; namely, "*Christ,—the provisions of the Gospel,—eternal life,—the Holy Spirit.*" But are these mere *offers*, and not *gifts*? That God *hath given his only begotten Son*, Mr. F. dare not deny. That the provisions of the gospel, or the bread of life, is a *gift*, is clear, from the words of Christ, St. John vi. 33.—"For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." That eternal life is given to man, is evident from the declarations, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent:" Which knowledge is conveyed to us in the gospel. And the Holy Spirit is given, not only to sanctify, but to "reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment." But for the *improvement* of these blessings, man is accountable, and for their *misimprovement*, he becomes criminal.—Thus we find that what Mr. F. calls *offers*, are *blessings* already conferred on man, for the use of which he must be answerable to his Creator.

The efforts of our examiner, in the communication which we have now briefly reviewed, seems to be little more than a bluster of words to hide the weakness of his arguments: for any thing like a clear and logical defence of the sermon is, indeed, a hopeless task.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Where the desire of being agreeable supersedes the desire of being worthy, the character may be pleasing, but can never be estimable.



## LOOK AT THIS,

AND GIVE IT AN ATTENTIVE PERUSAL.

We are aware that lengthy communications are frequently neglected, on account of the time it may require to peruse them: But we have no hesitancy in saying, that whoever will reflect upon the following communication will find that his time is well improved; and should he re-peruse it, and treasure its evidences in his remembrance; he would never find occasion to regret that his time has been mispent.

ED.

FROM THE GOSPEL HERALD.

*An illustration of the general, and great advantages of believing in the doctrine of the universal and eternal happiness of the souls of all the human family.*

The heart of *benevolence*, the tongue of *eloquence*, the pen of *genius*, the diction of deep research, and profound wisdom, have been employed to illustrate and recommend the *divine* and consolatory doctrine of the salvation of the whole of human souls, upon arguments drawn from an exposition of the christian scriptures, and no doubt but what an appropriate effect has been produced. I do not, however, recollect ever to have seen any arguments advanced in support of *this* doctrine, deduced from a consideration of the *great* and *general* advantages to be derived to man from its belief. Yet, to use the language of Addison, while treating of the immortality of the soul, I consider the belief and establishment of *this* precious doctrine, "the basis of morality, and the source of all the pleasing hopes, and secret joys, that can arise in the heart of a reasonable creature." Indeed, the belief of the immortality of the soul, does not afford much ground for comfort, unless it is associated with that of the *certain* salvation of *this* immortal soul; but is the source of much *fear* and *misery* to most people, and it causes many to wish for, and often to believe in the doctrine of *annihilation*; and others in that of *materialism*. I, therefore, with the most religious solicitude, and a warm wish to do my fellow-creatures good, invite attention to the following remarks, which I make with the purest love to them. For, *homo sum et humani a me nil alienum futo*. I am a man, and nothing which relates to man can be foreign to my bosom.

If any who may read these arguments, which I have written in support of the heavenly doctrine of *Universal Salvation*, drawn from the great advantages of believing it, shall receive as much pleasure therefrom, as I did while writing them, I shall be more than rewarded.

The foundations of the several arguments I use, to support my assumption of this divine and consolatory doctrine, are the following:

1. The reasonableness of the doctrine, drawn from a consideration of the *goodness*, *wisdom* and *power* of God.
2. The piety of the doctrine.
3. The congeniality of the doctrine to the best feelings of the soul.
4. The religious and moral advantages of such a belief.
5. The civil advantages of the doctrine.

First. Of the *reasonableness* of the doctrine of *Universal Salvation*. What the light of the sun is to the eyes, and the eyes are to the *understanding* of man in a natural point of view, the *divine scripture* is to the *understanding*, and the understanding to *reason*. When the eyes discern objects plainly, they present them to the understanding in their true colours, shapes, and qualities, and they are disposed of accordingly. So when the understanding can discover moral objects plainly, it presents them to the reason in their true features and qualities, and reason will approve or disapprove of them according to the truth or falsity, or the agreeableness or disagreeableness of the view. Now the subject of moral information, under present review, is, whether it is

true or not true, that God Almighty will make *all* human souls *eternally* happy in their next state of existence. The ground of argument assumed, is, that he *will*. It will be granted by *all* persons of common understanding, that *all* the information man has, either of God, or his will respecting the human family, is derived from the divine scripture which he has communicated, and that they have no other way of understanding it but by the exercise of their reason—no information would be of the least use to man without reason. The understanding then being the eye of the soul, by the light of the scripture it discovers an object, the *salvation of all souls*, and it presents to reason, "God our Saviour," *all good*, and reason informs, that a being who is *all good* will consult and secure the happiness of *all* other beings that he has brought into existence, if he can. The understanding represents to reason, the divine being *all-wise*, and reason informs, that an *all-wise* being can devise a way to save all souls, in accordance with the dictates of his goodness. The understanding presents God *all-powerful*, and reason informs that an *all-powerful* being can execute any work that his *goodness* suggested and his *wisdom* devised. Therefore, the analogical conclusion of this reason, is, that all souls will be made *eternally* happy in their next, or a future state of existence.

To justify this conclusion, the understanding refers to the information which the divine scriptures furnish of the *goodness* of God in the formation, and preservation of man, and the bestowment of mental and corporeal comforts, in the display of the interposition of Jesus, the forgiveness of sins, and promise of great glory in the next state of being. Of his *power* in the formation of the universe of celestial and terrestrial worlds, and of his *wisdom*, in the arrangement and harmonious movement of all objects, animate and inanimate. When the understanding presents to the reason the truth as recorded on the face of its sun, the scripture, that "God will have all men to be saved," reason informs, that the will of an *Almighty* Being shall be accomplished—that it is logically true, that a *cause* will produce an appropriate effect—that the cause, which is the *will* of an *all-powerful* God, must produce its effect, as certain as fire will consume—and the effect to be produced is the *eternal happiness of all souls*.

Secondly. Of the piety of the doctrine of *Universal Salvation*. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ said, while on earth, that "this is life eternal, that they [the people] should know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ;" and every man will acknowledge, that the phrase life, which occurs in the New Testament, when it applies to the soul, means happiness, while associated with the body or out of it. The true meaning, then, is, to know God aright, is to be happy. It is evident, however, that none can be happy unless they love God, neither in this life nor in the life to come, and it is equally evident, that none can love him, unless he is revealed to them as a God of love, and *fully* believe that he loves them, and not only them, but *all* their fellow-creatures also.

If this is true reasoning, it is easy to be seen that the belief of the doctrine of *universal* love, and the *Universal Salvation* of all souls, has a tendency to create and promote, in the souls of all such believers, *true piety*, or love to God; while the contrary doctrine of a *partial* salvation, or an uncertain one, has a tendency to obscure the *true* and interesting character of God, and to make men have unhappy feelings, and hard thoughts of him, and to bury their talents in the earth.

Thirdly. Of the congeniality of the belief of the doctrine of the Salvation of *all* Men, with the best feelings of the soul. The best feelings of the soul of man are *benevolence* and *humanity*, and these feelings are approved of by God himself, who has enjoined on man their cultivation as being calculated to promote individual, and public happiness. Now by a reference to the dictates of the *benevolence* of the soul it will be found, that nothing less than the *eternal*

happiness of *all* souls will satisfy it; such is the extent of its affectionate embrace. And also if we refer to the dictates of *humanity*, we will discover that the present, and *eternal* happiness of all our fellow-creatures is wished for, as well of the unworthy as those of the worthy and deserving.

Perhaps there are no persons on earth, who would not make *every* one of their fellow-creatures completely happy if they had the power so to do; such would be the result of the small remains of that Divine benevolence which dwells in the human soul. Nor is there perhaps on earth, one person among the most *depraved*, *turbulent* and *vindictive* who could, or would allow any of their fellow-creatures to suffer *greatly*, and *eternally*, on their own account if they could prevent it, though the sufferer might be their enemy, but they would hold out the hand of forgiveness and help; such would be the result of the finest and best feelings of the soul, of *humanity*, of *mercy*. If then the *worst* of men could not withstand the Divine influence of humanity, in reference to the sufferings of an enemy, surely the best could not witness unmoved, and without pity, the *eternal* sufferings of their friends, of their children! Now God is not only better than the best of men, but he is *benevolence* and *mercy*, abstractly considered. "God is love;" and the souls of the whole human family are his children. Hence we see that the doctrine of the salvation of *all* souls is congenial with the dictates of benevolence and humanity, and that the contrary doctrine of the *eternal* misery of some, is repugnant to both of those best of feelings of the soul, those *relies* of its divinity, and in the exercise of which only, man can imitate his holy Parent.

Fourthly. Of the moral and religious advantages of the belief of the doctrine of *Universal Salvation*. Whatever doctrine represents God in the most amiable and loving character, will have the greatest tendency to cause man to love; and of course to imitate him; hence the divine Scriptures are full of representations of the Divine *benevolence* for the imitation of man. Now whatever causes man to love God, will cause him to love his brother also, his fellow-man. The scripture says "How can we love God whom we have not seen, if we do not love our brother whom we have seen?" Implying, that if we do love God, we will of course love our brother. From hence it is evident, whatever doctrine produces in man the most love to God, will produce the most to man, of course, the most attention to those moral and religious duties which man owes to man.

If the doctrine of *universal* salvation represents God to be good to *all* mankind, those who love him will imitate him in the exercise of goodness to *all*.—If the doctrine of *universal* salvation represents God to be merciful to *all* mankind, those who love him, will imitate him in the exercise of mercy to *all*. If the doctrine represents God to be just to *all* mankind, (not unjust in saving some, and damning others,) those who love him will imitate him in the exercise of *justice* to *all*. The exercise of universal morality that springs from the principle of love to God and man, comprehends the whole duties of religion, so that the doctrine of the salvation of *all* souls, has a tendency to promote morality and religion. It will prevent men from doing harm, and induce them to do good. The contrary doctrine, however, of a partial, or uncertain salvation of men, has the effect to produce immorality and crime. Almost every person who is an enemy to any one, whom he intends to harm, is willing to believe, and generally does believe that God takes side with them, and is the enemy of the intended victim. Therefore, they feel the more willing to do an injury, and in many cases conceit that they are doing God service, while injuring their fellow-men. Such, therefore, act towards their brethren contrary to goodness, to mercy and justice, calculating that the injured brother will be sent to hell; while they will get to heaven, and see each other no more. But if *all* mankind *fully* believed that *all* their fellow-creatures were *equally* interested in the love of God, in his *goodness*, *mercy*



and justice, and would most certainly be eternally happy, and associate with each other in their next state of existence, and know each other, and love each other, how could they willingly act towards each, in this world, wickedly, unmercifully, or unjustly? They could not, they would not.

Again, that disposition of soul called *piety*, which interests the heart to attend cheerfully to the will of God, which enables man to do good, to bear burdens, and to make sacrifices in reference to his will, is produced from a belief of his *great love* to man. If, says Jesus, *any man love me he will keep my commandments*. And this love springs from the belief that God loves *all*, and will have *all* to be saved, and that Christ gave himself a ransom for *all*.

Fifthly. *Of the civil advantages of the doctrine.* At the time of the formation of man, God said that it was not good for him to be alone, he made him an help-meet, and the association was calculated to produce reciprocal happiness; and so it is now with all mankind, in proportion to the reciprocity of love. Hence our Saviour said, Do unto others, as you would they should do to you. Be good to *all*, be merciful to *all*, and be just to *all*—love *all*, imitate the impartial love of God. This every believer in the doctrine of the universal love of God, and universal salvation of man, will endeavour to attend to, and will attend to it from choice; but those who believe that God hates some, will hate those whom they may think he hates, and injure them also, if their feelings or interest lead them to it. Would one of the disciples of our Lord have said, “Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us and we forbade him, *because he followeth not us?*” Or at another time, would they have asked the Saviour, if they should command fire to come down from heaven and consume men, if they had fully believed that the Saviour loved those people, as well as he did them? If these disciples and many others since, fully believed that whosoever should offend one of these little ones who believed on Jesus, had *better* have a millstone hung about their necks and be cast into the sea, would they have offended them, as they have done, and now do? Would any offend a believer in the universal doctrine, who may be said to be a true believer in the Saviour of *all men*? No.

If the apostle Paul had believed that the Christians whom he so violently persecuted, were the objects of God's love, and would be the glorified companions of his love, in the next state of existence, would he have persecuted them as he did? Would Paul in his turn have been so often persecuted, and at length put to death, for his love to, and his faith in the Redeemer, if his persecutors had fully believed that God was no respecter of persons? Would the wicked Emperor of Rome, *Nero*, fifty-five years after Christ, have laid to the charge of the Christians the burning of Rome, and put so many thousands of them to death, if he had believed that these Christians would certainly be his happy and beatified associates in those Elysian regions, to which men's hopes aspire? No! Would the Christians, in the reign of Constantine the great, have been so fond of destroying so many thousands of the Pagans, if they had believed that these Pagans had mansions assigned them in the heavenly kingdom, as well as for themselves? I think not. Would the kings and governors of the Christian powers, at different times, have destroyed so many millions of the Jews, if they believed that God was the friend and Saviour of the Jews, as well as of the Christians and Gentiles? Would the popes of the Roman church, at different times, have sent out their bulls against their fellow-creatures, and destroyed such vast numbers of them with fire and sword, for professing to believe, and interpret the will of God respecting themselves, according to the best of their knowledge of the Scriptures, if they had believed that Christ would save all souls, let them believe what they might, and that souls were not saved by their belief, but by God? Would John Calvin, one of the Protestant reformers,

have put any one to death for believing differently from himself, if he had believed that it was the will of God to have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, and that Christ had given himself a ransom for *all*? Surely not. Would the Roman Catholics in France and England, at different times, put to death so many thousands of *Protestants*, and many women and children; if they had believed that God loved those *Protestants* as well as he did them, and that they were as sure of heaven? Or would the *Protestants* have acted the same bloody tragedy a few years afterwards? No: they would not, had they believed that God loved them, and that he would receive their souls into his heavenly kingdom, to be the glorified and loving companions of their murderers.

Mankind would not only have been innocent of the crime of shedding so much blood, and of causing so much misery to each other, from religious considerations, had they believed in the heavenly doctrine of Universal Salvation, but they would not have injured each other as they have done from other motives. Would any person willingly and maliciously wound the feelings of a fellow-creature, if he believed all would be saved? Would any person injure the reputation of any, if he believed that God was their friend, and would vindicate their cause? Would detraction and slander, the scorpions of the earth, be let loose, if *all men* believed that they were joint heirs of eternal glory? Would the cruelty and injustice of man torment his fellows, if all believed that they were brethren, and God was their common Father? Would one person cheat and ruin another, would they enslave and oppress each other, would they beat and murder each other, if they fully believed that they should associate with each other in great glory? No, they would not, they could not; but they would feel more love for, and act more tenderly towards each other, than the most affectionate natural brothers or sisters ever did.

It is not, however, contended that *all* or any of such believers would feel or act perfectly right, in *all* points towards each other; it is conceded that under the influence of any belief, man will feel and act *wrong*, while associated with the flesh; but the belief of his eternal redemption has great tendency to enable him to act above his earthly propensities, and to bear with the faults, and pity the frailties of his brethren, to make men bear each other's burdens, and so fulfil the law of love. Those who believe that “God is love,” and will make all men *eternally* happy, believe that he made man subject to vanity, not wantonly, but in hope of redemption; and that the hope which is predicated on the scriptures will be realized. While associated with the body, man will be, in some measure, under the influence of this *carnal* mind, which is *enmity* to the law of God, still they believe that they shall be delivered from this body of sin and death, be made *holy*, and of course, *eternally* happy.

Now if all mankind believed this, and felt this, would slaughtering armies go forth to destroy their fellow-creatures? No: war, bloodshed and carnage would cease, and harmony, love and universal peace would reign on earth amongst men. I fully believe, that if ever that millenium state of righteousness and peace, which is looked for, takes place on earth, it will be when *all* mankind believe that God our Saviour will bring all souls to a state of holiness and eternal happiness.

Sixthly. *Of the private and individual advantages of the belief of the doctrine of Universal Salvation, in life, and in death.* Although the Almighty thought proper to drive our first parents out of the garden of Eden, to prevent their return, and to curse the ground for their sake, still he loved man, for he is love; yet man believes that he is hated of God, and that God is his enemy, and always will be, unless he suffers, or does something to reconcile God to him. To do away this false belief and unhappy feeling from man, the blessed God formerly proclaimed to man, that he did not hate him, but loved him, and

forgave his sins and transgressions. Still, however, men generally believed that God hated them, was angry with them, of course they feared and were tormented. At length God was manifested in Christ, reconciling the world (the people) *unto himself*, by not imputing their trespasses unto them, and by making such an extraordinary display of his love to them, by giving his only Son, to die on the cross, that whosoever believed on him should not perish. He committed the words, or information, of reconciliation to the apostles, who did not fail to beseech men to be reconciled to God, by believing he loved them. Now had all the succeeding propagators of the Gospel of the grace of God, represented God our Saviour in his true and loving character, as the apostles did, told the people that God was never irreconciled to them, but always loved man, and always would, and to convince man that he did love him, he manifested himself in Christ, to reconcile man to him—had all the preachers of the Gospel declared this, it would indeed have been glad tidings of great joy to *all* people; and all people would have shared in the blessing. But the contrary course has been pursued generally, by the popes of Rome, and all their adherents to this day. They have represented the Almighty as the enemy of all men, except those who obtained and secured his favour by their own belief, or by their own actions; or that he has made a selection of a part of mankind before they came into existence, whom he was determined to love and make eternally happy, without any regard to their merits, and that he made the residue to be eternally miserable.

Now every one must know that these representations of the character and determination of God, have had an injurious effect on mankind. When the child grows to the age of moral reflection, he is induced by representations from the press, from the pulpit, and from conversation, to view his Maker as an enemy, and conscious of having violated God's law, which extends its requisitions to the thoughts of the heart, he then, as a natural consequence, hates God. The result of such a feeling is, that he is indifferent about knowing the will of the Almighty, for he believes that he cannot do it, and he buries his talent in the earth, or spends his substance in riotous living and searches for pleasure among swine. He is unhappy for he is afraid of God. Should he believe, however, that he is destined by God's decree to eternal misery, he becomes desperate; but should he believe he is one of the *elect*, he too frequently becomes an arrogant sinner, believing he will not suffer for his crimes in *this* life, nor in the life to come. Those who believe God to be their enemy, generally believe that all the misfortunes which they meet with in life, are the results of his anger; much of the benevolence common to man is extinguished by the influence of fear and hatred to God, & by Pharisaic presumption. The finest feelings of the soul are curbed—the exercise of laudable ambition is prevented, and genius is nipped in its bud. Not believing that God will forgive him, man will not forgive his neighbour. Thus in general mankind live in fear and hatred of God and each other, indulging in crimes, and suffering misery in this life, and are in dreadful bondage to the fear of death, which they believe will introduce their souls to *eternal* torments in a hell of fire and brimstone. Although some people have no fear of going to hell themselves, yet the fear that some of their children, or others whom they love tenderly, will suffer, makes them as miserable as if they feared for themselves. Hence sickness of children fills the parent, who does not believe in *Universal Salvation*, with great misery. O! says such, if my child should die, poor creature, it may go to Hell! This feeling is the torment of the human heart,—but the misery is augmented when parents contemplate the scene of the judgment of an assembled world, and behold their children trembling on the left hand of the stern Judge, to hear their dreadful doom pronounced, consigning them to interminable fire! This has made



many a worthy man and woman go down to the grave in great sorrow. These fearful expectations are calculated to make parents often wish their children annihilated, and to cause them to be careless about their education, supposing that all their attention towards the improvement of their minds may be of no account, and that they are likely to be lost to them eternally. But if parents believed that themselves and children were to be eternally happy together, and know and love each other, in a better world, what encouragements would they have to improve the minds of their offspring, knowing that all the cultivation of mind, which their children would receive here, would not be lost, but would increase their felicity. What pleasure would they have in raising them, and with how much more resignation could they give them up to God their Divine Father, who would present them again, adorned with angelic beauty! The fear of death is needful to give sanction to penal laws for individual security and to preserve life, but this fear is only tormenting, when the fear of hell is superadded; and those who obscure the true character of God, and exhibit a terrific one, are amenable for all the misery produced thereby. O that the true character of God our Saviour should thus be hid from poor suffering man!

The subject of the great advantages to be derived to man from believing the doctrine of *Universal Salvation*, is so momentous, that I cannot attempt to note the half of its divine beauties; yet hope to see it investigated thoroughly and exhibited in all its divine charms, and to know that it is embraced by all people, and then shall I know all will be happy. Even so Lord Jesus, Amen. D. G.

Union District (S. C.) May 27, 1825.

NOTE.—The writer of the above communication says, he has preached twenty-seven years, and until recently has been of the Baptist persuasion; but is now a believer and preacher of the salvation of all men. To such an one it is not improper to say—Now thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.

#### MINUTES

Of the Proceedings of the General Convention of Universalists, September, 1825.

The Ministers and Delegates composing the General Convention of Universalists of the New-England States and others, assembled, according to adjournment, in HARTLAND, (Vt.) on the 20th of Sept. 1825, and opened the session, by uniting with Br. Paul Dean, in solemn thanksgiving and prayer.

Organized the Council, by choosing Br. PAUL DEAN, Moderator, Br. RUSSELL STREETER, Clerk, and Br. DOLPHUS SKINNER, Assistant Clerk.

Appointed Brs. H. Ballou, 2d. R. Streeter, and K. Haven, a Committee to receive applications for Letters of Fellowship and Ordination, and to make a seasonable report thereof to this Council.

Br. Wm. Morse addressed the Throne of Grace, and the Council adjourned to meet again on Wednesday morning, at 8 o'clock.

Wednesday, A. M. 8 o'clock—convened in Council, and invoked the Divine blessing with Br. C. Gardner.

Read the Certificates and Letters of Delegates from several societies, and attended to verbal reports from others; and received gratifying and encouraging intelligence.

Voted, To grant the request of the following Societies, to be received into the fellowship of the General Convention of Universalists, viz. "The Restorationist Society in Royalton," (Vt.) "The First Universalists Society of Piermont," (N. H.) "The Universal Society of Restorationists in Richmond," (N. H.) "The Universalist Society in Randolph," (Vt.) "The First Society of United Christian Friends, called Restorationists, at Saratoga Springs," (N. Y.) and "The Universalist Society of South Woodstock," (Vt.)

Voted, To grant the request of the Universalist Society in Hartland, to have Br. R. Bartlett installed,

during the session, as Pastor of that church and society.

#### PUBLIC EXERCISES, WEDNESDAY, A. M.

The first prayer by Br. W. Morse; the sermon by Br. S. Cobb, from Matt. xxii. 37—40; the last prayer by Br. K. Haven.

#### PUBLIC EXERCISES—AFTERNOON.

First prayer by Br. David Ballou; the sermon by Br. H. Ballou, from 1 Kings iii. 5; the closing prayer by Br. Wm. Bell.

Having returned to the Council Hall, it was *Resolved*, on motion of a brother, to appoint a Committee to deliberate on the expediency of forming a *Charitable Society*, for the purpose of raising a Fund for the relief of Widows and Orphans of deceased brethren in the ministry of Universal Grace, who may be left in indigent circumstances: Whereupon, Brs. H. Ballou, Paul Dean, S. Streeter, D. Ballou, and R. Bartlett were chosen.

#### EVENING SERVICE.

First prayer by Br. Warren Skinner; sermon by Br. Wm. Morse, from 1 John iv. 16; last prayer by T. G. Farnsworth.

Br. S. Cobb called upon the Lord, and the Council adjourned to Thursday morning 8 o'clock.

Thursday morning, 8 o'clock—convened in Council, and supplicated the blessings of Heaven, with Br. Aaron Kinsman.

Received heart-cheering intelligence by the Reports of the committees appointed at the last session of this Convention, to visit the several Associations, the names of which are given below.

Appointed Brs. A. Kinsman, R. Streeter and K. Haven, a committee, to visit the *Northern Association* of Universalists, to be holden at Danville, Vt. on the first Wednesday and Thursday of Oct. 1825. Brs. E. Turner, S. Cobb and R. Streeter, to visit the *Eastern Association* at Union, Me. on the fourth Wednesday and Thursday in June, 1826. Brs. John Bisbee, Jr. D. Pickering and J. Flagg, to visit the *Southern Association* at Dana, Mass. on the second Wednesday and Thursday in June, 1826. Brs. H. Ballou, Ed. Turner, and Paul Dean, to visit the *Rockingham Association* at Meredith Bridge, N. H. on the fourth Wednesday and Thursday of August, 1826. Brs. L. Willis, R. Bartlett and W. Bell, to attend the *New-Hampshire Association* at Jaffrey, N. H. on the first Wednesday and Thursday in June, 1826. Brs. H. H. Winchester, J. Brooks and W. Skinner, to visit the *Franklin Association*, at Wilmington, Vt. on the third Wednesday and Thursday of October, 1825.

Voted, That this Council accept the report of their Committee, to grant Letters of Fellowship to Brs. Orestes A. Brownson, of Ballston, N. Y. James H. Bugbee, of Providence, R. I. Zenas Thompson, of Turner, Me. Josiah Gilman, of Guilford, N. H. and Ezekiel Vose, of New-London, N. H. as preachers of the Gospel of Christ; and that Ordination be conferred on Brs. Wm. Bell and M. B. Ballou, as approved laborers in "this ministry."

#### PUBLIC ORDINATION SERVICE.

THURSDAY MORNING—Introductory prayer by Br. A. Kinsman; sermon by Br. S. Streeter, from Isaiah xlii. 4; consecrating prayer by Br. R. Streeter; the charge and delivery of the scriptures, by Br. Samuel Hilliard; right hand of fellowship, by Br. S. Cobb; concluding prayer by Br. L. Willis.

Preparations having been made by the brethren in Hartland, for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the symbolical elements were administered, by Brs. Dean and S. Streeter, through the assistance of Deacons of different churches, to about two hundred participants, in the presence of a large assembly of spectators.

#### PUBLIC INSTALLATION SERVICE.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON—Introductory prayer by Br. C. Gardner; sermon by Br. P. Dean, from Acts xx. 28; installing prayer by H. Ballou; charge and delivery of the scriptures by Br. R. Streeter; right hand of fellowship by Br. H. Ballou, 2d. concluding prayer by Br. D. Skinner.

Being assembled in Council, *Resolved, unanimous-*

ly, That this Convention approve the doings of the Eastern Association, in forming the "Christian Visitant Society," for the publication and gratuitous distribution of interesting and useful articles in a pamphlet form.

Voted, That the next Session of this Convention be held at WELLS, Vt. on the third Wednesday and Thursday in Sept. 1826.

Voted, That Br. Russell Streeter be appointed to prepare and superintend the printing of the minutes of the proceedings of this Session of the Convention; and that the same be published in the *Christian Intelligencer*, printed at Portland, Me. accompanied by a Circular Letter, as soon as may be convenient.

Voted, That Br. Streeter be also requested to publish the Constitution of the General Convention of Universalists, accompanied with the amendment which was adopted at Strafford, Vt. Sept. 1824.

The business of this meeting having been amicably conducted and satisfactorily completed, the Council united with Br. Russell Streeter in offering the humble tribute of thanksgiving and supplication to the Giver of every good and perfect gift; and adjourned the session as above determined.

PAUL DEAN, Moderator.

- A true copy,

RUSSELL STREETER, } Clerks.  
DOLPHUS SKINNER, }

NOTE.—The visiting members of the Convention would be pleased in expressing, in their individual capacity, their obligations of gratitude to the Brethren and Friends in Hartland, of whose liberality and kind attentions they shared so bountifully; nor would they neglect exhibiting a proper tribute of respect and praise, to the accomplished choir of singers, led by Mr. Josiah Perkins of Windsor, whose excellent performances animated the devotions of the temple, did honour to the science and art of music, and excited in the hearts of a crowded auditory, sentiments of high esteem for the performers whose attendance was so punctual and becoming.

#### MINISTERS PRESENT.

H. Ballou, P. Dean, S. Streeter, M. B. Ballou, Boston; H. Ballou, 2d, Roxbury; C. Gardner, Charlestown; T. G. Farnsworth, Newton, (Mass.); S. Cobb, Waterville, R. Streeter, Portland, and Z. Thompson, Turner, (Me.); W. Skinner, Langdon, L. Willis, Lebanon, D. Ballou, Richmond, E. Vose, New-London, W. Bell, Pelham, and J. Gilman, Guilford, (N. H.); W. Morse, late of Philadelphia, (Penn.); D. Skinner, Saratoga Springs, and O. A. Brownson, Ballstown, (N. Y.); S. Hilliard, Clarendon; A. Kinsman, Wells, K. Kaven, Bethel, and R. Bartlett, Hartland, (Vt.); J. H. Bugbee, Providence, (R. I.)

#### MARRIED,

On Sunday evening, by Rev. Mr. Pickering, Mr. Thomas J. Arnold, of Smithfield, to Miss Nancy Lyon, of this town.

On Wednesday morning, by Rev. Mr. Pickering, Mr. Thomas J. Hill, to Miss Betsy Brown, both of Pawtucket.

On Monday evening, by Rev. Mr. Tobey, Mr. Phillip S. Trafton, to Miss Rebecca H. Lyon, both of this town.

On the 5th inst. by Rev. Mr. Wilson, Mr. Caleb Coggeshall, to Miss Emily Clarke, both of this town.

#### DIED,

In this town, on the 5th inst. Mary Coffin, infant daughter of Col. Walker Humphry.

On the 6th inst. Sarah B. Danforth, second daughter of Mr. Ozias Danforth, aged 15.

On the 6th inst. Mr. John Gardiner, of Savannah, Georgia.

On the 7th inst. suddenly, Maria Jackson, daughter of Mr. Henry D. Weedon, aged 2 years.

On Saturday evening last, John Weeks, youngest son of Mr. Charles Low, aged 17 months.

On Saturday last, Mr. Nathan H. Turrill, in the 34th year of his age.